

CAC Meeting – December 11, 2003
Hopland Bypass.

Meeting notes prepared by: Alan Escarda, Project Manager

In Attendance:

<u>CAC Member</u>	<u>PHONE NUMBER</u>
Tom Ashurst	707-744-1251
Gregory Taylor	707-744-1154
Brian Manning	707-744-1611
Ava Kong	707-744-1171
Michael Burke	707-744-2040
Susanne Zechiel	707-744-7589
Mike Milovina	707-744-8828
Colin Brooks	707-744-1936
Ted Starr	707-744-1396
Terry Rosetti	707-486-4669

Caltrans Members: Alan Escarda, Project Manager; Praj White, Design; Aaron Mckeeon, Environmental.

Others: Ladd Cahoon and Mike Manning.

Assignments from October 15, 2003

15	Alan	Mail out meeting minutes.	completed
16	Praj	Bring power point presentation to next meeting and the big maps.	completed
17	Alan	Mail out the latest alignment maps to the CAC	completed
18	Praj	Bring computer simulations (renderings) and Preliminary VA study report	completed

Assignments from December 11, 2003

15	Alan	Send memory notes and next meeting agenda out to the CAC.	January 2004
16	Praj	Bring wall maps and Power Point presentation to next meeting	2-3-04
17	Praj	Bring any new renderings	2-3-04
18	Alan	Update website	ongoing

Project Status

The status of the project was discussed with those in attendance. The project has been delayed, and staffing has been reduced. This reduction was in response to the current state budget crisis, which

affects project resources for the current and next fiscal years. The result is a project delay of one year for completion of the project report/environmental document. The next PDT meeting will be scheduled for June 2004 and the next Public Meeting will be scheduled for July 2004.

The project continues to maintain strong support from District Management and the local regional transportation agency, Mendocino Council of Governments (MCOG). The Hopland Bypass has become the highest priority of MCOG, since the programming of the Willits Bypass in 1998.

Environmental Studies

The technical studies of the various alignments will not be completed until January 2006. Bird surveys and preparation of the visual site assessment will take place this winter and spring. Biological surveys will be conducted this spring. Preliminary Archeological surveys are complete.

Other Information

The Preliminary VA report is expected by March 2004, but an executive summary will be posted on the website in January. Before the full report is made available, an internal review will have to be conducted. The traffic forecasting report was discussed and is posted on the website. The report concludes that congestion will become intolerable for the local residents in the next 20 years unless action is taken.

The new Hopland Bypass Website address is:

<http://www.dot.ca.gov/dist1/d1projects/hopland/index.htm>

CAC Review of Alternates E1 and VE2

E1

- North and south interchanges not likely to induce development.
- 175 interchange could induce development.
- Relinquish issues of existing 101 to County?
- Would have to ensure existing 101 is in a good state of repair before relinquishment.
- South interchange is crucial
- Visual site assessment will be conducted using key view sites and a consistent methodology, but aesthetics is the most subjective of the tech reports.
- Should have an analysis of emergency response time for each alternative.

Recommended Modifications:

Keep HWY 101 green steel bridge.

Spacing of interchanges is good, but would like south interchange closer.

PROS.

- Location of CDF interchange is good
- Less noise impacts to old Hopland residents from freeway noise
- Minimize need for concrete structure
- Least impact to floodway

CONS.

- Requires largest disposal site.
- Traffic increase on 175
- Potential need to upgrade 175
- Too far from town for local business
- Long Term stability issues

- One of the more aesthetically pleasing Alts.
- Disposal site not needed
- Least amount serpentine soil.
(Not sure of validity of above statement).
- Best visual aesthetics (from valley perspective and drivers).
- Keeps traffic off of main street, preserves small town nature.
- Would provide good access for existing businesses to the east
Or for someone who wants to develop business to the east.
- We like north interchange.
- Maintenance costs will be highest
- Only option that takes an individual home?
- Emergency response (CDF, Hopland Fire)
Especially in the summer, would be slower.
- Largest amount of RW needed.
- Largest environmental footprint.
- Largest impact to wildlife migration.
- Potential to develop "new" east Hopland.
- Splits only irrigated pasture of Field Sta.
- Greatest oak woodland impacts.
- Greatest number of rare species impacted.
- Largest of amount of cut (2.8^{M3}) and fill.

VE2

Recommended Modifications:

Keep HWY 101 green steel bridge.

PROS.

- Minimize pristine land impact
- Minimize traffic impacts through old Hopland
- Minimize traffic on Route 175

CONS.

- Noise impacts to old Hopland residences
- Interchange make it difficult for emergency response.
- No interchange for town, local business loss
- Native American sites impacted.
- Potential to split the community in regards to future development, for example see the result of the existing hwy... which is old & new Hopland.

Next CAC Meeting date

When: February 3, 2004, 6pm to 8pm.

Location: UC Field Station.

Desired outcome for February 3, 2004 meeting?

Review and critique alternatives VW3, VW2 and VE3.

Provide a list of pros and cons with recommendations and forward to the design team/PDT.

Set agenda and time for next CAC meeting.

It was agreed that the previous ground rules would be in effect (see below) for the meeting and Alan would facilitate.

1. Ground Rules

1. 1. Start and end on time.

1. 2. One conversation at a time.
1. 3. Cell phones set to stun.
1. 4. Be courteous.
1. 5. No smoking.
2. Decision making process:
 2. 1. Consensus, if possible.
 2. 2. This is not a technical decision making group.

It is important to note that, for a variety of compelling reasons, Caltrans cannot always implement input provided by the CAC. When this occurs, the Department will provide a clear reason.

Definition: The Community Advisory Committee provides a regular forum for community members, organizational representatives, and the Department to communicate with each other regarding the projects on an ongoing basis.

Role: The CAC will serve as the primary voice of the community on topics pertaining to the development phase of the Hopland Bypass project. The CAC is intended to help identify problems and articulate and clarify key issues of interest to the local community.

The advisory committee is not a decision-making body.

The CAC is intended to communicate local viewpoints to the Project Development Team – the project’s technical committee. The Project Development Team makes final project recommendations to Department Management.